

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for review of the present application. Claims 1-21 are now pending in the present application. Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that Claims 15-17 present allowable subject matter.

The Official Action of February 16, 2007, rejects Claims 1-14 and 18-21. Claims 1-14 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,789,215 to Rupp (hereinafter “the Rupp patent”).

Applicant has amended Claims 1, 5, 9, 12, and 15-17 and has canceled Claims 13 and 14.

Applicant further provides the following remarks in response to the rejections set forth in the Office Action.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Office Action objects to Claims 15, 16, and 17 as depending from a rejected base claim. That is, Claims 15, 16, and 17 each depend from Claim 14, which depends from Claim 13, which depends from Claim 12. Each of Claims 15, 16, and 17 recites that a troubleshooting script with at least two modes of operation includes separate routines to collect and test a configuration of the email gateway depending upon a specific reported functionality of the email gateway. Each of Claims 15, 16, and 17 refers to a different specific reported functionality (i.e., Claim 15: “whether the email gateway is receiving mail or delivering mail”; Claim 16: “whether the email gateway is not receiving incoming or outbound mail”; and Claim 17: “whether the email gateway is not delivering incoming or outbound mail”).

Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 5, 9, and 12 to capture what Applicant believes to be patentable subject matter presented in Claims 15, 16, and 17, objected to in the Office Action (i.e., that a troubleshooting script with at least two modes of operation includes separate routines to collect and test a configuration of the email gateway depending upon a specific reported functionality of the email gateway). Applicant submits that the Rupp patent does not each of disclose that a troubleshooting script with at least two modes of operation includes separate routines to collect and test a configuration of the email gateway depending upon a specific reported functionality of the email gateway.

Accordingly, for an analogous reason to why Claims 15, 16, and 17 present allowable

subject matter, Applicant submits that Claims 1, 5, 9 and 12 also each present allowable subject matter and that such claims are in a condition for allowance. In view of the remarks presented above, Applicant submits that pending Claims 1-21 are in a condition for allowance. Applicant submits that the present amendments and above remarks overcome the § 102(e) rejections.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks presented above, Applicant submits that all of the pending Claims 1 - 21 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of the allowance of the application is respectfully requested. In order to expedite the examination of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in order to resolve any remaining issues.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper, such as the fees for a request for an extension of time. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher J. Gegg
Registration No. 50,857

CUSTOMER NO. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111
LEGAL02/30357163v1

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON May 10, 2007.